arXiv:1108.2554v2 [math.LO] 25 Jun 2012

LOCAL DP-RANK AND VC-DENSITY OVER INDISCERNIBLE SEQUENCES.

VINCENT GUINGONA,
CAMERON DONNAY HILL

Abstract. In this paper, we study a localized version of dp-rank and show this local version relates to the standard global dp-rank in the natural way. We also show that local dp-rank, VC-density over indiscernible sequences ($\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density), and UDTFS-rank over indiscernible sequences are all identical. As a corollary, we get that $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density is always integer valued.

1. Introduction

Since the advent of stability theory, there have been several fashions in the development of model theory. After several years of concentrating on stability theory proper, the combinatorial faction moved on to simple theories, establishing an extensive technology around these. Of course, any simple unstable theory has the independence property (and not the strict order property), and it is only relatively recently that model theorists (outside of o-minimality) have turned attention to dependent unstable theories (theories with NIP) as such.

One of the important projects in the study of dependent theories is to find a reasonable analogue for dependent theories of super-stability and super-simplicity. The notion of strong dependence seems to be the most popular proposal so far. Its definition is often rendered through the auxiliary notion of dp-rank, and (at least) two equivalent definitions of dp-rank have appeared in the literature. We present these, and the reader will find that both of these definitions are "global" in character.

We begin by recalling the definition of ICT-pattern (found also in [2, 4, 7, 9]):

Definition 1.1. Fix $n \leq \omega$, $\alpha \leq \omega$ and a tuple of variables $\overline{x}$. An *ICT-pattern of depth n and length α in the variables $\overline{x}$* is a collection of formulas $\varphi_i(\overline{x}; \overline{y}_i)$ together with an array $\langle \overline{b}_{i,j} : i < n, j < \alpha \rangle$ where $\lg(\overline{b}_{i,j}) = \lg(\overline{y}_i)$ for $i < n$ such that, for all $s \in {}^n\alpha$, the following φ-type is consistent:

$$\{\neg\varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{b}_{i,j}) : i < n, j < \alpha, j \neq s(i)\} \cup \{\varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{b}_{i,s(i)}) : i < n\}. \tag{1}$$

If $\alpha = \omega$, we say this is an *ICT-pattern of depth n in the variables $\overline{x}$*.

Date: June 27, 2012.

For $n < \omega$, we will say that a tuple of variables $\overline{x}$ has *dp-rank* $\leq n$ if there exists no ICT-pattern of depth $n+1$ in the variables $\overline{x}$. Of course, assuming there are no repetitions, this depends only on the length of $\overline{x}$, so if $k = \lg(\overline{x})$, we will denote this by $\mathrm{dpR}(k) = \mathrm{dpR}(\overline{x}) \leq n$.

Another rendering of dp-rank goes through complete types:

Definition 1.2. Let $B \subset \mathfrak{C}$, and let $q(\overline{x})$ be a complete type over B. Then $\mathrm{dpR}(q) \leq n$ if for any realization $\overline{a} \models q$ and any $n+1$ mutually B-indiscernible sequences $I_0, ..., I_n$, at least one of them is indiscernible over $B\overline{a}$.

(Here, "mutually B-indiscernible" means that for each $k \leq n$, I_j is indiscernible over the enlarged set $B \cup \bigcup_{k \neq j} I_k$.)

Equivalently, $\mathrm{dpR}(q) \leq n$ if and only if there does not exist an ICT-pattern so that each type as in (1) is consistent with q (see Definition 1.2 of [4], where they call this a *randomness pattern*). By setting $\mathrm{dpR}(k) = \max\{\mathrm{dpR}(p) : p \in S_k(T)\}$, one recovers the equivalence of these definitions of dp-rank easily enough. In any case, we then have the following definition of strong dependence:

Definition 1.3 ([8])**.** A theory T is *strongly dependent* just in case there is no ICT-pattern of depth ω.

Using Definition 1.2, [4] shows that dp-rank is sub-additive in the following sense.

Theorem 1.4 (Theorem 2.7 of [4])**.** *If* $\mathrm{dpR}(1) \leq n$, *then* $\mathrm{dpR}(k) \leq kn$ *for all* $k < \omega$. *More precisely, for any* $k < \omega$ *and* $a_0, ..., a_{k-1} \in \mathfrak{C}$, *if* $\mathrm{dpR}(\mathrm{tp}(a_i/B)) \leq n$ *for each* $i < k$, *then* $\mathrm{dpR}(\mathrm{tp}(a_0...a_{k-1}/B)) \leq kn$.

While super-simplicity *per se* is not really a local property, the basic concepts of stability and simplicity are local: a single formula can be stable even in an unstable theory; a theory is simple just in case all local D-ranks are finite. One aspect of this paper, then, is to establish a definition for "local dp-rank" and to demonstrate that our definition really is the natural localization of the existing global definitions. We then consider two (modified) concepts that are relatively well-known in the world of dependent theories, VC-density and uniform definability of types over finite sets (UDTFS). For both concepts, we consider restrictions to (finite) indiscernible sequences. That is, we examine $\mathrm{vc}_{\mathrm{ind}}$, VC-density where parameter sets must be indiscernible sequences, and $\mathrm{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}$, which is UDTFS-rank where, again, parameter sets must be indiscernible sequences. We show that both $\mathrm{vc}_{\mathrm{ind}}$ and $\mathrm{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}$ are in fact identical to local dp-rank, and this fact has a number of interesting consequences, which we examine in the conclusion. This relationship is, to our knowledge, the first established connection between dp-rank and a definability-of-types condition.

We should note that the eventual goal of our study is to understand VC-density and UDTFS-rank over all sets. However, in this paper, we restrict our attention to indiscernible sequences. We do this for two reasons. Firstly, working over indiscernible sequences simplifies the problem and yields tangible results – one has to start somewhere. For example, the local UDTFS conjecture holds over indiscernible sequences (Theorem 1.2 of [3]) but is still open over all sets. Secondly, when restricting VC-density and UDTFS-rank to indiscernible sequences, one gets a direct relationship with local dp-rank. No such relationship holds when looking over all sets.

2. Definitions

There are many ways of characterizing dp-rank, including extendability of mutually indiscernible sequences (see Definition 1.2 above or Lemma 1.4 of [9]). In this paper, we wish to take a local approach. A direct definition of local dp-rank turns out to be somewhat cumbersome to work with, so we first make an auxiliary definition regarding functions on finite linear orders:

Definition 2.1. Let $M = \{0, 1...., M-1\} < \omega$ be an integer, and let $f : M \to 2$ be some function. Let $0 < N, n < \omega$. Consider a family of subsets $X_0, ..., X_{n-1} \subset M$ such that

$1_{N,n}$. for each $i < n$, X_i is convex;
$2_{N,n}$. for each $i < n$, $|X_i| \leq 2N+1$.

If

$$S = M \setminus (\{0, 1, ..., 2N\} \cup X_0 \cup \cdots \cup X_{n-1})$$

for some family $(X_i)_{i<n}$ satisfying $1_{N,n}$ and $2_{N,n}$, then we say that S is an (N,n)-*remainder of* M (to define S, we exclude not only the convex sets X_i but also the first $2N+1$ elements of M). The convex subsets of S form a partition of S corresponding to the equivalence relation; set $i \sim_S j$ if the closed interval between i and j is contained in S. If $f(i) = f(j)$ whenever $i \sim_S j$, then we say that S is f-*good* (is good for f); otherwise, S is f-*bad* (is bad for f).

For the remainder of this paper, we work in a complete, first-order theory T with monster model $\mathfrak{C}$. For a formula $\theta(\overline{x})$, let $\theta(\overline{x})^0 = \neg\theta(\overline{x})$ and let $\theta(\overline{x})^1 = \theta(\overline{x})$. Define the *truth value* function TV from the set of all $\mathfrak{C}$-definable sentences to $2 = \{0, 1\}$ as follows:

$$\mathrm{TV}(\sigma) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \vDash \sigma \\ 0 & \text{if } \vDash \neg\sigma \end{cases}$$

Definition 2.2. We say that a formula $\varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y})$ has *dp-rank* $\leq n$, denoted $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi) \leq n$, if there is an $N < \omega$ such that for all $M < \omega$, all indiscernible sequences $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < M \rangle$, and all $\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{x}}$, there is an (N,n)-remainder $S \subset M$ which is good for the function $i \mapsto \mathrm{TV}(\varphi(\overline{a}; \overline{b}_i))$.

We can relate this to an equivalent model theoretic statement. The following proposition is easy to verify using a simple compactness argument:

Proposition 2.3. *For any formula $\varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y})$ and $n < \omega$, $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi) \leq n$ if and only if, for all indiscernible sequences $\langle \overline{b}_i : i \in \mathbb{Q} \rangle$ and all $\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{x}}$, there exists a convex equivalence relation $\sim$ on $\mathbb{Q}$ with exactly $n+1$ infinite $\sim$-equivalence classes and at most n singleton $\sim$-equivalence classes (and no other $\sim$-classes) so that, for all $i, j \in \mathbb{Q}$ with $i \sim j$, $\vDash \varphi(\overline{a}, \overline{b}_i) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\overline{a}, \overline{b}_j)$.*

Before moving on, we record a purely combinatorial lemma on remainders that will be useful for proving that our local dp-rank is really the appropriate localization of the existing global dp-rank.

Lemma 2.4. *Let $n, N, M < \omega$, and suppose $f : M \to 2$ is such that* no *(N, n)-remainder of M is good for f. Then there is an order-preserving injection $g : (n+2)N \to M$ such that*

1. *$f(g(i)) = f(g(j))$ whenever $lN + 1 < i, j < (l+1)N$,*
2. *$f(g(lN)) \neq f(g(lN+1))$,*

for all $l = 0, 1, ..., n+1$.

Proof. Firstly, set $\alpha_{-1} := 0$ and for $l = 0, 1, 2, ..., n$, define

$$\alpha_l = \min \{j : \alpha_{l-1} + 2N < j < M \wedge f(j) \neq f(j+1)\}$$

Also, define $X_l = \{j : \alpha_l \leq j \leq \alpha_l + 2N\}$ for each $l = 0, 1, ..., n$. This construction is possible simply because none of the (N, n)-remainders given by $\{X_l : l \leq m\}$ for $m < n$ is f-good. Now, observe that for each $l \leq n$, $(\alpha_l - 1) - (\alpha_{l-1} + 1) \geq 2N$. By pigeonhole, we may select $j_2^{l-1} < \cdots < j_{N-1}^{l-1}$ in the interval $(\alpha_{l-1} + 1, \alpha_l)$ such that $f(j_s^{l-1}) = f(j_t^{l-1})$ for all $s, t = 2, ..., N-1$.

Finally, define $g : (n+2)N \to M$ as follows:

- $g(lN) = \alpha_l$ and $g(lN+1) = \alpha_l + 1$ for $l = 0, ..., n$
- $g(lN + s) = j_s^{l-1}$ for $l = 0, ..., n$ and $s = 1, ..., N-1$.

It's easy to see that g has the desired properties. □

We move now to the definitions of $\mathrm{vc}_{\mathrm{ind}}$, VC-density over indiscernibles, and $\mathrm{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}$, UDTFS over indiscernibles. We also look briefly at the unrestricted versions of these ideas.

Definition 2.5. We say that a formula $\varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y})$ has *VC-density* $\leq \ell$ for some positive real number ℓ if there exists $K < \omega$ such that,

$$\left|S_\varphi(A)\right| \leq K \cdot |A|^\ell$$

for all finite sets $A \subset \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{y}}$. We denote this by $\mathrm{vc}(\varphi) \leq \ell$.

Recall that $S_\varphi(A)$, for $A \subset \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{y}}$, denotes the set of φ-types over A, and a φ-type is just a maximal consistent subset of $\{\pm\varphi(\overline{x}, \overline{a}) : \overline{a} \in A\}$.

Definition 2.6. We say that a formula $\varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y})$ has *VC_{ind}-density* $\leq \ell$ for some positive real number ℓ if there exists $K < \omega$ such that, for all finite indiscernible sequences $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < M \rangle$ (with $M \geq 1$), we have that

$$\left|S_\varphi(\{\overline{b}_i : i < M\})\right| \leq K \cdot M^\ell.$$

We denote this by $\mathrm{vc}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi) \leq \ell$.

Definition 2.7. We say that a formula $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$ has *independence dimension* $\leq d$, denoted $\mathrm{ID}(\varphi) \leq d$, provided,

$$\left|S_\varphi(A)\right| < 2^d$$

for all finite sets $A \subset \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{y}}$ with $|A| = d$ (Note: this is the dual notion of VC-dimension, so it is sometimes denoted $\mathrm{VC}^*(\varphi) = \mathrm{ID}(\varphi)$). We say that a formula has *NIP* (or is *dependent*) if $\mathrm{ID}(\varphi) < \omega$. A theory T has *NIP* (or is *dependent*) if all formulas have NIP.

From a well-known theorem of Laskowski (see [5]), we know that $\mathrm{vc}(\varphi) < \omega \iff \mathrm{ID}(\varphi) < \omega$. Obviously, $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density is bounded above by the usual VC-density – that is, for all formulas $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$, $\mathrm{vc}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi) \leq \mathrm{vc}(\varphi)$. However, the reverse – $\mathrm{vc}(\varphi) \leq \mathrm{vc}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi)$ – can fail even in ω-stable theories (see Lemma 4.8 of [1] for example). The following theorem is a simple application of compactness and Ramsey's Theorem.

Theorem 2.8. *For any formula $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$, the following are equivalent:*

1. $\mathrm{ID}(\varphi) = \infty$,
2. *There is an indiscernible sequence $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < \omega \rangle$ in $\overline{y}$ such that for every $W \subseteq \omega$, there is an $\overline{a}_W \in \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{x}}$ such that $\models \varphi(\overline{a}_W;\overline{b}_i) \iff i \in W$ for all $i < \omega$.*

From this, the following proposition is straightforward, although there seems to be no hope of explicitly relating the three quantities in general.

Proposition 2.9. *For any formula $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$, the following are equivalent:*

1. $\mathrm{vc}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi) < \omega$
2. $\mathrm{ID}(\varphi) < \omega$,
3. $\mathrm{vc}(\varphi) < \omega$.

The last concept we consider is that of "uniform definability of types over finite sets," abbreviated UDTFS (see, for example, [3] for more details). Here, we deal with its restriction to indiscernible sequences, and we have found it most natural to deal with this idea as a rank.

Definition 2.10. We say that a formula $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$ has *$\mathrm{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-rank* $\leq n$ for some positive integer n if there exists some $K, N < \omega$ and a finite collection of formulas

$$\{\psi_\ell(\overline{y};\overline{z}_{0,0},...,\overline{z}_{0,N-1},...,\overline{z}_{n-1,0},...,\overline{z}_{n-1,N-1},\overline{w}_0,...,\overline{w}_{K-1}) : \ell < L\}$$

such that, for all finite indiscernible sequences $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < M \rangle$, there exists $i_0,...,i_{K-1} < M$ such that, for all $\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{x}}$, there exists $j_0,...,j_{n-1} < M$ and $\ell < L$ such that, for all $i < M$,

$$\models \varphi(\overline{a};\overline{b}_i) \text{ if and only if } \models \psi_\ell(\overline{b}_i;\overline{b}_{j_0+0},...,\overline{b}_{j_0+N-1},...,\overline{b}_{j_{n-1}+0},...,\overline{b}_{j_{n-1}+N-1},\overline{b}_{i_0},...,\overline{b}_{i_{K-1}}).$$

We will denote this as $\mathrm{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi) \leq n$.

Proposition 2.11 (Theorem 1.2 (ii) of [3])**.** *For any formula $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$, $\mathrm{ID}(\varphi) < \omega$ if and only if $\mathrm{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi) < \omega$.*

Given Proposition 2.9, it follows that $\mathrm{vc}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi) < \omega$ if and only if $\mathrm{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi) < \omega$. This correspondence is actually as tight as possible – in Theorem 4.1, we show that these two ranks are both *equal to* local dp-rank.

3. LOCALIZING THE DEFINITION OF dp-RANK

We dedicate the first part of this section to the proof of Proposition 3.1, showing that global dp-rank and local dp-rank coincide in the natural way. For clarity in the exposition, we break the proof into two lemmas, 3.2 and 3.3. Subsequently, we take a slightly closer look at how much indiscernibility is actually relevant in the definition of local dp-rank, and we look briefly at the (im)possibility of sub-additivity of local dp-rank.

Proposition 3.1. *For a fixed tuple of variables $\overline{x}$ and $n < \omega$: $\mathrm{dpR}(\overline{x}) \leq n$ if and only if, for all formulas $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$, $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi) \leq n$.*

Lemma 3.2. *If $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})) > n$, then $\mathrm{dpR}(\overline{x}) > n$.*

Proof. Assume $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})) > n$. We define $\psi(\overline{x};\overline{y}_0,\overline{y}_1)$ to be the formula $\neg(\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y}_0) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y}_1))$. By compactness, it suffices to prove the following,

Claim. *For each $K < \omega$, there is an indiscernible sequence $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < (n+2)\cdot 2K\rangle$ such that the derived array $\left\langle \left(\overline{b}_{2i+l\cdot 2K}, \overline{b}_{2i+l\cdot 2K+1}\right) : l \leq n, i < K\right\rangle$ together with $\psi(\overline{x};\overline{y}_0,\overline{y}_1)$ is an ICT-pattern of depth $n+1$ and length K.*

Let $K < \omega$ be given, and set $N = 4(K+1)$. Since $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi) > n$, there are an indiscernible sequence $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < M\rangle$ and a tuple $\overline{a}$ such that the function $i \mapsto \mathrm{TV}(\varphi(\overline{a},\overline{b}_i))$ admits no good (N,n)-remainder. By Lemma 2.4, there is an order-preserving injection $g : (n+2)N \to M$ such that

- $lN + 1 < j < j' < (l+1)N \implies \models \neg\psi(\overline{a},\overline{b}_{g(j)},\overline{b}_{g(j')})$
- $\models \psi(\overline{a},\overline{b}_{g(lN)},\overline{b}_{g(lN+1)})$.

for all $l \leq n+1$. We claim the array $\left\langle \left(\overline{b}_{2i+l\cdot 2K}, \overline{b}_{2i+l\cdot 2K+1}\right) : l \leq n, i < K\right\rangle$ works. To see this, choose any map $s : (n+1) \to K$. From this, fix some order-preserving injection $h_s : 2K(n+1) \to (n+2)N$ such that, for all $l \leq n$,

$$h_s(2\cdot s(l) + l\cdot 2K) = lN \text{ and } h_s(2\cdot s(l) + l\cdot 2K + 1) = lN + 1.$$

Since $N = 4(K+1)$, this is always possible. We therefore get that, for all $l \leq n$, for all $i < K$,

$$\models \psi(\overline{a},\overline{b}_{g(h_s(2i+l\cdot 2K))},\overline{b}_{g(h_s(2i+l\cdot 2K+1))}) \text{ if and only if } i = s(l).$$

Therefore, by indiscernibility with the formula

$$\theta_s(\overline{x};\overline{y}_j)_{j<2K(n+1)} := \exists \overline{x} \bigwedge_{l\leq n, i<K} \psi(\overline{x},\overline{y}_{2i+l\cdot 2K},\overline{y}_{2i+l\cdot 2K+1})^{\text{if } i=s(l)},$$

we see that there exists some $\overline{a}_s$ such that, for all $l \leq n$, for all $i < K$,

$$\models \psi(\overline{a}_s,\overline{b}_{2i+l\cdot 2K},\overline{b}_{2i+l\cdot 2K+1}) \text{ if and only if } i = s(l).$$

Therefore, $\left\langle \left(\overline{b}_{2i+l\cdot 2K}, \overline{b}_{2i+l\cdot 2K+1}\right) : l \leq n, i < K\right\rangle$ together with $\psi(\overline{x};\overline{y}_0,\overline{y}_1)$ is an ICT-pattern of depth $n+1$ and length K. ☐

Lemma 3.3. *If $\mathrm{dpR}(\overline{x}) > n$, then, for some $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$, $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})) > n$.*

Proof. Supposing that $\mathrm{dpR}(\overline{x}) \geq n+1$, let $\left\langle \psi_i(\overline{x}, \overline{y}_i), \left\langle \overline{b}_{i,j} : j < \omega \right\rangle : i \leq n \right\rangle$ be any ICT-pattern in $\overline{x}$ of depth $n+1$. Let $\varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y}_0, ..., \overline{y}_n)$ be the formula $\bigvee_{i \leq n} \psi_i(\overline{x}; \overline{y}_i)$. We will verify that $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi) \geq n+1$. By Ramsey's theorem and compactness, we may assume that the sequence $\left\langle (\overline{b}_{0,j} ... \overline{b}_{n,j}) : j < \omega \right\rangle$ is indiscernible. Now we show that, for every $N < \omega$, there is an $\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{x}}$ such that there is *no* (N, n)-remainder for the function

$$f : 5N(n+2) \to 2, f(j) = \mathrm{TV}(\varphi(\overline{a}; \overline{b}_{0,j}, ..., \overline{b}_{n,j}))$$

Let $s : n{+}1 \to \omega$ be given by $s(i) = 5N(i+1)$, and set $Z = \{5N(i+1) : i \leq n\}$, the image of s. By hypothesis, we choose an $\overline{a} = \overline{a}_s$ such that

$$\vDash \psi_i(\overline{a}, \overline{b}_{i,j}) \iff s(i) = j$$

for all $i < \omega$, and it follows that

$$\vDash \varphi(\overline{a}; \overline{b}_{0,j}, ..., \overline{b}_{n,j}) \iff j \in Z$$

when $j < 5N(n+2)$. Now, suppose that S is an (N, n)-remainder of $5N(n+2)$ via $(X_0, ..., X_{n-1})$. It's not difficult to see that $|X_i \cap Z| \leq 1$ for every $i < n$, so $S \cap Z \neq \emptyset$. Now, if for some $j \in S \cap Z$, $j/{\sim_S}$ contains two elements, then f is not constant on $j/{\sim_S}$, and so S is not f-good. On the other hand, if $j/{\sim_S} = \{j\}$ for each $j \in S \cap Z$, then there is an $\sim_S$-class C with at least $N(3n+10) - (2n+1)$ elements; hence, there is an $i < n$ such that $5N(i+1)$ and $5N(i+2)$ are both in C. It follows that f is not constant C, and S is not f-good. Thus, there is no way that S is f-good, and as S was arbitrary, this completes the argument. □

Lemma 3.4. dpR *is sub-additive for Boolean combinations:*

1. $\mathrm{dpR}(\neg\varphi) = \mathrm{dpR}(\varphi)$ *for every formula* $\varphi = \varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y})$.
2. *For any formulas* $\varphi_1(\overline{x}_1; \overline{y}), \varphi_2(\overline{x}_2; \overline{y})$, *if* $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi_1) \leq n_1$ *and* $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi_2) \leq n_2$, *then* $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi_1 \wedge \varphi_2) \leq n_1 + n_2$.

Proof. Notice that (1) is trivial. To show (2), suppose $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi_l) \leq n_l$ via $N_l < \omega$ for each $l = 1, 2$. Suppose $M < \omega$, $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < M \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence in $\mathfrak{C}^{\overline{y}}$, and $\overline{a}_l \in \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{x}_l}$ for $l = 1, 2$. For each $l = 1, 2$, let S_l be an (N_l, n_l)-remainder of M via $(X^l_0, ..., X^l_{n_l-1})$ which is good for the function,

$$i \mapsto \mathrm{TV}(\varphi_l(\overline{a}_l; \overline{b}_i))$$

Set $N = \max\{N_1, N_2\}$, and let S be the (N, n_1+n_2)-remainder of M obtained from the family X^1_j for $j < n_1$ together with X^2_j for $j < n_2$. Then, it's not hard to see that S is good for the function,

$$i \mapsto \mathrm{TV}(\varphi_1(\overline{a}_1; \overline{b}_i) \wedge \varphi_2(\overline{a}_2; \overline{b}_i)).$$

□

Remark 3.5. There is little reason to think there is an analog of Lemma 3.4 for treating quantifiers, and consequently, it seems unlikely that one could prove Theorem 1.4 *without* passing through Definition 1.2 or something very close to it. In this regard at least, the argument for sub-additivity of dp-rank in [4] is "from the book."

To finish this section, we note that considering fully indiscernible sequences $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < M \rangle$ in the definition of local dp-rank is not really necessary.

Definition 3.6. For a partitioned formula $\varphi = \varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y})$ and $M < \omega$, let Δ_{φ}^{M} be the set of formulas,

$$\Delta_{\varphi}^{M}(\overline{y}_0, ..., \overline{y}_{M-1}) = \left\{ \exists \overline{x} \bigwedge_{i<m} \varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y}_i)^{s(i)} : m \leq M, s : m \to 2 \right\}$$

Now, the last proposition of this section follows form what we have already done by standard compactness arguments.

Proposition 3.7. *The following are equivalent for any partitioned formula* $\varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y})$*:*

1. $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y})) \leq n$
2. *There are* $N, N' < \omega$ *such that for any* $M < \omega$*, any* $\Delta_{\varphi}^{N'}$*-indiscernible sequence* $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < M \rangle$ *and any* $\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{x}}$*, there is an* (N, n)*-remainder* S *good for the function* $i \mapsto \mathrm{TV}(\varphi(\overline{a}; \overline{b}_i))$ *(in fact,* $N' = 5N(n+2)$ *suffices).*

4. RELATING $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{IND}}$-DENSITIES, $\mathrm{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-RANKS, AND DP-RANKS OF FORMULAS

In this section, we show that the indiscernible-restricted versions of VC-density and UDTFS are precisely the same as local dp-rank. Subsequently, we collect a few interesting but relatively straightforward consequences.

Theorem 4.1. *For any partitioned formula* $\varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y})$ *and any* $n < \omega$*, the following are equivalent:*

- (i) *The* $\mathit{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}$*-rank of* φ *is* $\leq n$*;*
- (ii) *The* $\mathit{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$*-density of* φ *is* $\leq n$*;*
- (iii) *The dp-rank of* φ *is* $\leq n$*.*

That is, $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi) = \mathrm{vc}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi) = \mathrm{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi)$.

Proof of (i) ⇒ (ii). Suppose $\mathrm{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi(\overline{x}; \overline{y})) \leq n$ via

$$F = \{\psi_l\left(\overline{y}; (\overline{z}_{i,j})_{i<n, j<N}, (\overline{w}_k)_{k<K}\right) : l < L\}$$

for some $N, K, L < \omega$. Now, if $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < M \rangle$ is an indiscernible sequence in $\overline{y}$, it is not hard verify, using F, that there is surjective map

$$L \times M^n \to S_{\varphi}\left(\{\overline{b}_i\}_{i<M}\right)$$

which shows that $\left| S_{\varphi}\left(\{\overline{b}_i\}_{i<M}\right) \right| \leq LM^n$. As $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < M \rangle$ was arbitrary and L is fixed, it follows that $\mathrm{vc}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi) \leq n$. ☐

Proof of (ii) ⇒ (iii). Suppose that the dp-rank of φ is $> n$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.2, for any $K < \omega$, we may assume that there exists an indiscernible sequence $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < 2K(n+2) \rangle$ and $\overline{a}$ such that

(i) For all $\ell \leq n+1$, all $2K\ell < j < j' < 2K(\ell+1)$, $\vDash \varphi(\overline{a};\overline{b}_j) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\overline{a},\overline{b}_{j'})$; and
(ii) For all $\ell \leq n$, $\vDash \neg(\varphi(\overline{a};\overline{b}_{2K(\ell+1)}) \leftrightarrow \varphi(\overline{a},\overline{b}_{2K(\ell+1)+1}))$.

For any choice of $i_0 < ... < i_n < K$, we can create an order-preserving map from K to $2K(n+2)$ for which $i_\ell \mapsto 2K(\ell+1)$ for all $\ell \leq n$. Using indiscernibility and the conditions above, each such map yields a different φ-type over $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < K\rangle$. Therefore, we see that

$$\left|S_\varphi(\{\overline{b}_i : i < K\})\right| \geq \binom{K}{n+1}.$$

Since $\binom{K}{n+1} \in \Omega(K^{n+1})$, this shows us that the $\mathrm{vc}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi) > n$. ☐

For the proof of (iii) ⇒ (i), it will be convenient to isolate a very useful lemma (proved in [3]) that quantifies how an indiscernible sequence can fail to be an indiscernible set.

Lemma 4.2 (Lemma 1.3 of [3]). *Let $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$ be a partitioned formula. Let $N < \omega$ and let $I = (I,<)$ be any linear order. For any Δ_φ^N-indiscernible sequence $\langle \overline{b}_i : i \in I\rangle$ which* is not *a Δ_φ^N-indiscernible* set, *there are a number $t < N-1$ and a formula $\delta \in \pm\Delta_\varphi^N$, such that*

$$\vDash \delta(\overline{b}_{i_0}, ..., \overline{b}_{i_{t-1}}, \overline{b}_{i_t}, \overline{b}_{i_{t+1}}, ..., \overline{b}_{i_{N-1}}) \wedge \neg\delta(\overline{b}_{i_0}, ..., , \overline{b}_{i_{t-1}}, \overline{b}_{i_{t+1}}, \overline{b}_{i_t}, ..., \overline{b}_{i_{N-1}})$$

for all $i_0 < i_1 < \cdots < i_{N-1}$ in I.

Proof of (iii) ⇒ (i). Suppose $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})) \leq n$, and let $N < \omega$ witness this as in Definition 2.2. Let $N' = 5N(n+2)$ and $\Delta = \Delta_\varphi^{N'}$.

Claim. *Suppose $M \geq N'$, $\{\overline{b}_i : i < M\}$ is a Δ-indiscernible set and $\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{x}}$. Then either $|\{i < M : \vDash \varphi(\overline{a};\overline{b}_i)\}| \leq n$ or $|\{i < M : \vDash \neg\varphi(\overline{a};\overline{b}_i)\}| \leq n$*

Proof of claim. If not, then by indiscernibility, we obtain $t \in \{0,1\}$ and $\overline{a}' \in \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{x}}$ such that

$$\vDash \varphi(\overline{a}';\overline{b}_i)^t \iff i \in \{5N(r+1) : r \leq n\}$$

Largely copying the last part of the argument for lemma 3.3, we find that $\mathrm{dpR}(\varphi) \geq n+1$, a contradiction. ☐

Now, for an indiscernible sequence $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < M\rangle$ and an $\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{x}}$, there are four cases to consider:

(1) $M \leq N'$;
(2) $M > N'$, $\{\overline{b}_i : i < M\}$ is a Δ-indiscernible set, and $|\{i : \vDash \varphi(\overline{a};\overline{b}_i)\}| \leq n$;
(3) $M > N'$, $\{\overline{b}_i : i < M\}$ is a Δ-indiscernible set, and $|\{i : \vDash \neg\varphi(\overline{a};\overline{b}_i)\}| \leq n$;
(4) $M > N'$, but $\{\overline{b}_i : i < M\}$ is *not* a Δ-indiscernible set.

For case (1), the set $F_1 = \{\psi_I : I \subseteq N'\}$ where

$$\psi_I\left(\overline{y};(\overline{w}_k)_{k<N'}\right) = \bigvee_{k\in I}(\overline{y} = \overline{w}_k)$$

works. Let

$$\psi_+ \left(\overline{y}; (\overline{z}_{i,0})_{i<n}\right) = \bigvee_{i<n} (\overline{y} = \overline{z}_{i,0}) \text{ and } \psi_- = \neg\psi_+.$$

The sets $F_2 = \{\psi_+\}$ and $F_3 = \{\psi_-\}$ cover cases (2) and (3). Therefore, it remains to build F_4 for case (4). That is, we may assume that $M > N'$ and $\{\overline{b}_i : i < M\}$ is not a Δ-indiscernible set.

By Lemma 4.2, there exists $\delta \in \pm\Delta$ and $t < N'$ such that, for all $i \neq j$ with $t \leq i, j \leq M - N' + t + 1$, we have that

$$i < j \text{ if and only if } \vDash \delta(\overline{b}_0, ..., \overline{b}_{t-1}, \overline{b}_i, \overline{b}_j, \overline{b}_{M-N'+t+2}, ..., \overline{b}_{M-1}).$$

That is, $N' - 2$ fixed parameters and one of the finitely many $\delta \in \pm\Delta$ are enough to define the implicit ordering $\overline{b}_t < \overline{b}_{t+1} < \cdots < \overline{b}_{M-N'+t+1}$. For simplicity, let $Y = \{t, t+1, ..., M - N' + t + 1\}$. By definition of local dp-rank, for each $\overline{a} \in \mathfrak{C}^{\overline{x}}$, $p = \mathrm{tp}_\varphi(\overline{a}/\{\overline{b}_i : i \in Y\})$, there is an (N, n)-remainder S_p good for the function $Y \to 2$ given by $i \mapsto \mathrm{TV}(\varphi(\overline{a}; \overline{b}_i))$. By definition, $S_p = Y \setminus (\{t, t+1, ..., t+2N\} \cup X_0 \cup ... \cup X_{n-1})$ for some family $(X_0, ..., X_{n-1})$ of the appropriate sort. Having established the ordering of $\langle \overline{b}_i : i < M \rangle$, the type p is determined entirely by the following data:

- The truth values $\varphi(\overline{a}; \overline{b}_i)$ for each $i \in \{0, 1, ..., t, t+1, ..., t+2N\} \cup X_0 \cup ... \cup X_{n-1} \cup \{M - N + t + 2, ..., M - 1\}$. Note that this set is bounded in size by $N' + 2N(n+1)$ independently of M.
- The truth values $\varphi(\overline{a}; \overline{b}_{i_C})$ where $\{i_C : C \in S/{\sim_S}\}$ is any family of representatives for the classes of $S/{\sim_S}$. Note that the size of $S/{\sim_S}$ is bounded by $n+1$ also independently of M.

Notice that the set $\{0, 1, ..., t, t+1, ..., t+2N\} \cup \{M - N + t + 2, ..., M - 1\}$ is fixed for all types over $\{\overline{b}_i : i < M\}$. Moreover, each X_i for $i < n$ is a convex set of size $2N + 1$, dependent only on its first element. Thus, one can compile these data together with $\delta \in \pm\Delta$ to define any $S_\varphi(\{\overline{b}_i : i < M\})$. More precisely, we let F_4 be the collection of formulas

$$\psi_{s,t,u,\delta}(\overline{y}; (\overline{z}_{i,j})_{i<n, j<2N+1}, (\overline{w}_k)_{k<N'+2N-1})$$

for each $s : N' + 2N - 1 \to 2$, $t : (n \times (2N + 1)) \to 2$, $u : (n + 1) \to 2$, and $\delta \in \pm\Delta$ that takes in $N' + 2N - 1$ static parameters (corresponding to $\{0, 1, ..., t, t+1, ..., t+2N\} \cup \{M - N + t + 2, ..., M - 1\}$) and $n(2N + 1)$ varying parameters (corresponding to X_0, ..., X_{n-1}) where δ gives the ordering, s gives the truth value on the static parameters, t gives the truth value on the varying parameters, and u gives the truth value on the $S/{\sim_S}$.

Finally, we see that $F = F_1 \cup F_2 \cup F_3 \cup F_4$ is a witness to the fact that $\mathrm{UDTFS}_{\mathrm{ind}}(\varphi) \leq n$. ☐

To conclude the paper, we look briefly at several interesting consequences of theorem 4.1.

Corollary 4.3. *The $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density of any formula is always an integer.*

This shows a sharp difference between VC-density and $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density. There are formulas φ with fractional VC-density (see, for example, Proposition 4.6 of [1]). However, all such formulas must have integer $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density.

Corollary 4.4. *Fix $n < \omega$. If all formulas of the form $\varphi(x;\overline{y})$ (with x a singleton) have VC_{ind}-density $\leq n$, then all formulas of the form $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$ have VC_{ind}-density $\leq n \cdot \lg(\overline{x})$.*

Proof. The hypothesis is equivalent to $\mathrm{dpR}(1) \leq n$ by Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 3.1. By Theorem 1.4, this implies that $\mathrm{dpR}(k) \leq nk$ for all $k < \omega$. Again by Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 3.1, this implies that all formulas of the form $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$ have $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density $\leq n \cdot \lg(\overline{x})$. ☐

Similarly, we can show that bounding the dp-rank of a theory is equivalent to bounding the $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density of all formulas. In particular, we get the following characterization of dp-minimality as a corollary:

Corollary 4.5. *A theory T is dp-minimal if and only if, for all formulas $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$, the VC_{ind}-density of φ is $\leq \lg(\overline{x})$.*

It is an open question (see [1]) whether or not this holds for standard VC-density. One direction is obvious, namely that if all formulas $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$ have VC-density $\leq \lg(\overline{x})$, then T is dp-minimal. However, the differences between VC-density and $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density make showing the other direction seemingly quite difficult; specifically, an arbitrary finite set does not *obviously* decompose into indiscernible sequences. However, in light of [6] (Subsection 3.2) together with our Proposition 3.7, there is some reason to expect VC-density and $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density that may be closely related when the formula $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$ in question is symmetric in $\overline{x}$ and $\overline{y}$ (so that $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$ defines the edge-relation of a graph on $\lg(\overline{x})$-tuples). In future work, we plan to investigate this possible connection.

To conclude, then, we state a few interesting questions that we have had no luck in resolving so far.

Open Questions. How exactly do VC-density and $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density relate to each other? Is there a way of characterizing when a formula will have the same VC-density and $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density? Are there any (interesting) theories where these are equal for all formulas?

An interesting question posed by Alf Onshuus is the following: Is it true that $\mathrm{dpR}(\overline{x}) \leq m$ if and only if, for all formulas $\varphi(\overline{x};\overline{y})$, the VC-density of φ is $\leq m$? By Theorem 4.1 and Proposition 3.1, this certainly holds if we replace VC-density with $\mathrm{VC}_{\mathrm{ind}}$-density.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Aschenbrenner, A. Dolich, D. Haskell, H.D. MacPherson, and S. Starchenko, *Vapnik-Chervonenkis density in some theories without the independence property, I*, preprint.

[2] A. Dolich, J. Goodrick, and D. Lippel, *dp-Minimality: Basic facts and examples*, Notre Dame J. Form. Log. **52** (2011), no. 3, 267–288.

[3] V. Guingona, *On uniform definability of types over finite sets*, J. Symbolic Logic **77** (2012), no. 2, 499–514.

[4] I. Kaplan, A. Onshuus, and A. Usvyatsov, *Additivity of the dp-rank*, preprint.

[5] M.C. Laskowski, *Vapnik-Chervonenkis Classes of Definable Sets*, J. London Math. Soc. **45** (1992), no. 2, 377–384.

[6] M. Malliaris and S. Shelah, *Regularity lemmas for stable graphs*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.

[7] S. Shelah, *Classification theory and the number of non-isomorphic models*, North-Holland Publishing Company, 1978.
[8] ———, *Strongly dependent theories*, preprint (2009).
[9] P. Simon, *On dp-minimal ordered structures*, J. Symbolic Logic **76** (2011), no. 2, 448–460.

(Guingona) University of Notre Dame, Department of Mathematics, 255 Hurley, Notre Dame, IN 46556

E-mail address: `guingona.1@nd.edu`

URL: `http://www.nd.edu/~vguingon/`

(Hill) University of Notre Dame, Department of Mathematics, 255 Hurley, Notre Dame, IN 46556

E-mail address: `Cameron.Hill.136@nd.edu`